



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,434	12/03/2003	Chester Vanek	FLATAU.0013P	6829

32856 7590 05/31/2005

WEIDE & MILLER, LTD.  
7251 W. LAKE MEAD BLVD.  
SUITE 530  
LAS VEGAS, NV 89128

EXAMINER
----------

CLEMENT, MICHELLE RENEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3641

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/727,434

Applicant(s)

VANEK ET AL.

Examiner

Michelle (Shelley) Clement

Art Unit

3641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 March 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 6 is apparently missing words, making it unclear what is configured to move from a forward to a retracted position, therefore rendering the claims indefinite.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 & § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Stead et al. (US Patent # 5,235,769). Stead et al. discloses a projectile launcher comprising a body, the body defining a receiving area that is capable of receiving a cartridge (reference 32) projectile mounted to a housing, the body defining a tubular

Art Unit: 3641

passage leading from the receiving area through which the projectile is ejected upon firing, the body further defining a chamber leading to the receiving area, the chamber positioned generally opposite the tubular passage, a breechblock movably positioned in the chamber, the breechblock movable between a retracted position in which it is positioned in the chamber away from the receiving area and an forward position in which it is moved towards the receiving area (Figures 9-13); a trigger mechanism (reference 66) connected to the breechblock, the trigger mechanism including a firing pin (reference 64) moveable to a position in which it contacts a portion of the cartridge in the receiving area when the breechblock is in the forward position; an extractor having the ability to contact the cartridge when the cartridge is in the receiving area and retain the housing of the cartridge upon firing; an ejector (reference 128), the ejector coupled to the breechblock and movable from a first retracted position to a second extended position, the ejector when moved from the first position to the second position pressing downwardly upon a retained housing to force the housing outwardly of the body through an opening therein; and a follower (references 120), the follower coupled to the ejector and configured to move downwardly from a first position to a second position when the ejector is moved to its second position, the follower when moved from its first to its second position adapted to move a cartridge into the receiving area. The projectile launcher further including a track located in the breechblock wherein at least a portion of the track slopes downwardly and a pin extending from the ejector, the pin engaging the track whereby movement of the breechblock effects the movement of the ejector from its first to its second position (Figures 9-12). Wherein the ejector is coupled to the breechblock such that movement of the breechblock to the retracted position causes the ejector to move to the second extended position. The projectile launcher further

Art Unit: 3641

including an opening in the body (reference 74), the opening in communication with the receiving area when the breechblock is moved to the retracted position. The projectile launcher is configured to move from its forward to its retracted position by pressure of gas in the receiving area when a cartridge therein is fired with the trigger mechanism. The projectile launcher including a spring biasing the breechblock towards its forward position (Figure 12). The projectile launcher wherein a grip (reference 70) is connected to the breechblock, the grip movable with respect to the body, permitting a user to move the breechblock manually. Although Stead et al. does not expressly disclose the projectile launcher for use with the specific ring airfoil projectile, it is noted that the recitation of said use is an intended or desired use of the product and does not serve to patently distinguish the claimed structure over that of the reference of Stead et al. The [a)statements of intended use or field of use, b)"adapted to" or "adapted for" clauses, c) "wherein" clauses, or d) "whereby"]clauses are essentially method limitations or statements of intended or desired use. Thus, these claims as well as other statements of intended use do not serve to patentably distinguish the claimed structure over that of the reference. See In re Pearson, 181 USPQ 641; In re Yanush, 177 USPQ 705; In re Finsterwalder, 168 USPQ 530; In re Casey, 512 USPQ 235; In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458; Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ 2nd 1647.

See MPEP § 2114 which states:

A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from the prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ 2nd 1647

Claims directed to apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than functions. In re Danly, 120 USPQ 528, 531.

Apparatus claims cover what a device is not what a device does. Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc., 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528.

Art Unit: 3641

As set forth in MPEP § 2115, a recitation in a claim to the material or article worked upon does not serve to limit an apparatus claim.

It has been held that the recitation that an element is "adapted to" perform a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. *In re Hutchison*, 69 USPQ 138.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michelle (Shelley) Clement whose telephone number is 571.272.6884. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Carone can be reached on 571.272.6873. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michelle Clement", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.